

1 Tina Wolfson, CA Bar No. 174806
twolfson@ahdootwolfson.com
2 Robert R. Ahdoot, CA Bar No. 172098
rahdoot@ahdootwolfson.com
3 Theodore Maya, CA Bar No. 223242
tmaya@ahdootwolfson.com
4 Bradley K. King, CA Bar No. 274399
bking@ahdootwolfson.com
5 AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC
6 2600 West Olive Avenue, Suite 500
Burbank, California 91505
7 Tel: (310) 474-9111; Fax: (310) 474-8585

8 *[Additional Counsel on Signature Pages]*

9 *Class Counsel*

10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
11 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
12 **SOUTHERN DIVISION**

13 PHILIP ALVAREZ, RANDALL
14 BETTISON, MARC KELLEHER, and
15 DARLENE VAUGH, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

16 Plaintiffs,

17
18 v.

19 SIRIUS XM RADIO INC.,

20 Defendant.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. 2:18-cv-08605-JVS-SS

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION FOR
FINAL APPROVAL OF CLASS
ACTION SETTLEMENT;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS
AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
THEREOF**

Hon. James V. Selna, presiding

Date: January 25, 2021
Time: 1:30 PM
Location: Courtroom 10C
411 West 4th Street,
Santa Ana, CA 92701

See, lifetimesiriusxmsettlement.com for
attendance details and dial in information
for video conference

[Declarations of Robert Ahdoot and
Patrick Donnelly filed concurrently]

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on January 25, 2021 at 1:30 p.m., in Courtroom 10C of the above-captioned Court before the Honorable James V. Selna, Plaintiffs Philip Alvarez, Randall Bettison, Marc Kelleher, and Darlene Vaugh (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) will and hereby do move for an Order Granting Final Approval of Class Action Settlement, pursuant to the Settlement Agreement and Release filed on June 11, 2020. (ECF 68.) Specifically, Plaintiffs seeks an Order:

1. Approving the proposed Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate to Plaintiffs and Class Members, and directing the Settlement’s consummation according to its terms;

2. Certifying the Settlement Class for settlement purposes;

3. Finding that the form and manner of class notice implemented pursuant to the Settlement: (i) constitutes reasonable and the best practicable notice; (ii) constitutes notice reasonably calculated, under the circumstances, to apprise Class Members of the pendency of the litigation, the terms of the proposed Settlement, the right to object to the proposed Settlement or exclude themselves from the Class, and the right to appear at the Final Approval Hearing; (iii) constitutes due, adequate, and sufficient notice to all persons entitled to receive notice; and (iv) meets the requirements of state and federal due process, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and any other applicable state and/or federal laws;

4. Finding that all Class Members shall be bound by the Settlement as it relates to the Class in which each is a member, including the release provisions and covenant not to sue;

5. Directing that judgment be entered dismissing with prejudice all individual and class claims asserted in the litigation and ruling that no costs or fees be assessed on either party other than as expressly provided in the Settlement;

1 6. Incorporating the release and related provisions set forth in the Settlement
2 and barring any Released Claims against the Released Parties;

3 7. Overruling all objections;

4 8. Approving distribution of the benefits to the Class Members consistent with
5 the Settlement; and

6 9. Retaining jurisdiction of all matters relating to the interpretation,
7 administration, implementation, and enforcement of the Settlement.

8
9 As discussed in the accompanying memorandum, approval of the Settlement and
10 the related relief requested herein is appropriate under applicable law and is well justified
11 under the circumstances of this matter.

12
13 This motion is based upon this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying
14 Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the concurrently filed Declarations of Robert
15 Ahdoot (Class Counsel) and Patrick Donnelly (Executive Vice President, General
16 Counsel, and Secretary of Sirius XM), the Settlement Agreement and Release previously
17 filed with the Court (ECF 68), all papers filed in support thereof, and such evidence and
18 argument as the Court may consider.

19
20 **NOTE:** Please check www.lifetimesiriusxmsettlement.com prior to the
21 hearing for attendance procedures, including details regarding dial in information via
22 video conference.

1 Dated: December 18, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,
AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC

3 By: /s/ Robert Ahdoot

4 Tina Wolfson
5 *twolfson@ahdootwolfson.com*
6 Robert Ahdoot
7 *rahdoot@ahdootwolfson.com*
8 Theodore W. Maya
9 *tmaya@ahdootwolfson.com*
10 Bradley K. King
11 *bking@ahdootwolfson.com*
12 2600 West Olive Avenue, Suite 500
13 Burbank, California 91505
14 Tel: (310) 474-9111; Fax: (310) 474-8585

12 Cornelius P. Dukelow
13 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
14 *cdukelow@abingtonlaw.com*
15 **ABINGTON COLE + ELLERY**
16 320 S. Boston Avenue, Suite 1130
17 Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103
18 Telephone & Facsimile: (918) 588-3400

17 Keith S. Dubanevich
18 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
19 *kdubanevich@stollberne.com*
20 **STOLL STOLL BERNE LOKTING & SHLACHTER**
21 **P.C.**
22 209 SW Oak Street, Suite 500
23 Portland, Oregon 97204
24 Telephone: (503) 227-1600
25 Facsimile: (503) 227-6840

24 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Class Counsel*

TABLE OF CONTENTS**Page**

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	BACKGROUND	3
	A. Factual and Procedural History	3
	B. The Parties Engaged in Extensive Settlement Negotiations	4
	C. Preliminary Settlement Approval and Dissemination of Notice	6
III.	THE SETTLEMENT	7
	A. The Settlement Class	7
	B. The Settlement Confers Substantial Benefits to Class Members	8
	C. Opt-Outs & Objections	9
	D. Payment of Settlement Administration Expenses, Service Payments, and Attorneys' Fees and Expenses	10
	E. Release	10
IV.	NOTICE WAS SUCCESSFULLY DISSEMINATED PURSUANT TO THE COURT-APPROVED NOTICE PLAN	10
V.	THE RESPONSE FROM THE CLASS IS OVERWHELMINGLY POSITIVE ..	11
VI.	THE COURT SHOULD GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE SETTLEMENT	12
	A. The Class Action Settlement Approval Process	12
	B. Final Approval of the Settlement is Appropriate	12
	1. The Strength of Plaintiffs' Case and the Risk, Expense, Complexity, and Likely Duration of Further Litigation Weigh in Favor of Settlement	13
	2. Plaintiffs Face the Challenge of Maintaining Class Action Status Leading up to and Through Trial	14
	3. The Benefits Conferred by the Settlement are Substantial	15
	4. Class Counsel Performed Sufficient Discovery, Research, and Analysis to Adequately Assess the Settlement and the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Class's Claims	15
	5. The Recommendations of Experienced Class Counsel Favor Final Approval	16
	6. No Presence of a Government Participant	17
	7. The Class Response Favors Final Approval	17
	8. Lack of Collusion Between the Parties	18

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
VII. THE OBJECTIONS	19
A. The Small Number of Objections – Five – Is Compelling Evidence that the Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate	19
B. The Objections Are Without Merit And Should Be Overruled	20
1. Objections That The Settlement Is Somehow Inadequate Have No Merit Because The Settlement’s Benefits Are Excellent And Certainly Fair, Reasonable, And Adequate	20
2. Notice To The Class Satisfies Due Process, the FRCP, And Was Executed In Accordance With The Court’s Order	24
3. The Requirements for Objecting Are Fair.....	25
VIII. CLASS ACTION TREATMENT IS APPROPRIATE FOR THIS SETTLEMENT	26
A. This Action Satisfies the Requirements of Rule 23(a).....	26
1. The Class is Sufficiently Numerous.....	26
2. There Are Common Questions of Both Law and Fact.....	27
3. The Class Representatives’ Claims Are Typical of Other Class Members’ Claims	27
4. Class Representatives and Class Counsel Fairly and Adequately Protect the Interests of the Class	27
B. The Predominance and Superiority Requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) are Satisfied.....	28
1. Common Issues of Law and Fact Predominate	29
2. Class Treatment Is Superior in This Case	29
IX. CONCLUSION	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>Amador v. Baca</i> , No. 2:10-cv-1649-SVW-JEM, 2020 WL 5628938 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 11, 2020).....	24
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Conn. Ret. Plans & Trust Funds</i> , 133 S. Ct. 1184 (2013).....	29
<i>Briseno v. ConAgra Foods, Inc.</i> , 844 F.3d 1121 (9th Cir. 2017).....	26
<i>Browne v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , No. 09-cv-06750-MMM-DTB, 2010 WL 9499072 (C.D. Cal. July 29, 2010).....	23
<i>Eisen v. Porsche Cars N. Am., Inc.</i> , No. 2:11-cv-09405-CAS, 2014 WL 439006 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2014)	23
<i>Evon v. Law Offices of Sidney Mickell</i> , 688 F.3d 1015 (9th Cir. 2012).....	28
<i>Garner v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , No. 08-cv-1365-CW, 2010 WL 1687832 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2010)	18
<i>Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs., Inc.</i> , No. C-06-4068-MMC, 2007 WL 221862 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2007), <i>aff'd</i> , 331 F. App'x 452 (9th Cir. 2009)	23
<i>In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 654 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2011).....	18
<i>In re Heritage Bond Litig.</i> , No. 02-ml-1475-DT, 2005 WL 1594403 (C.D. Cal. June 10, 2005)	18
<i>In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 213 F.3d 454 (9th Cir. 2000)	15
<i>In re Netflix Privacy Litig.</i> , No. 5:11-CV-00379 EJD, 2013 WL 1120801 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2013).....	12
<i>In re Omnivision Techs., Inc.</i> , 559 F. Supp. 2d 1036 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	19
<i>Lane v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 696 F.3d 811 (9th Cir. 2012)	23
<i>Mandujano v. Basic Vegetable Prods. Inc.</i> , 541 F.2d 832 (9th Cir. 1976).....	19
<i>Milligan v. Toyota</i> , No. 3:09-cv-05418-RS (N.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2012)	24
<i>Moore v. Verizon Commc'ns Inc.</i> , No. C 09-1823 SBA, 2013 WL 4610764 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2013)	19
<i>Nat'l Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.</i> , 221 F.R.D. 523 (C.D. Cal. 2004).....	17, 19
<i>Negrete v. Allianz Life Ins. Co. of N. Am.</i> , 238 F.R.D. 482 (C.D. Cal. 2006).....	30
<i>Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Com'n of City and County of S.F.</i> , 688 F.2d 615 (9th Cir. 1982)	13
<i>Palmer v. Stassinios</i> , 233 F.R.D. 546 (N.D. Cal. 2006).....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

Page(s)

<i>Parsons v. Ryan</i> , 754 F.3d 657 (9th Cir. 2014).....	27
<i>Pierce v. Rosetta Stone, Ltd.</i> , No. C 11-01283 SBA, 2013 WL 5402120 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2013)	18
<i>Richie v. Blue Shield of Cal.</i> , No. 13-cv-2693-EMC, 2014 WL 6982943 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2014).....	26
<i>Rodriguez v. Hayes</i> , 591 F.3d 1105 (9th Cir. 2010).....	27
<i>Rodriguez v. West Publishing Corp.</i> , 563 F.3d 948 (9th Cir. 2009)	13, 17
<i>Rosales v. El Rancho Farms</i> , No. 1:09-cv-00707-AWI-JLT (E.D. Cal. July 21, 2015)	18
<i>Slaven v. BP Am., Inc.</i> , 190 F.R.D. 649 (C.D. Cal. 2000).....	26
<i>Spalding v. City of Oakland</i> , No. C11-2867 TEH, 2012 WL 994644 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2012).....	27
<i>Staton v. Boeing Co.</i> , 327 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2003).....	13
<i>Stockwell v. City & County of San Francisco</i> , 749 F.3d 1107 (9th Cir. 2014).....	27

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 1715	17
------------------------	----

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a).....	26, 28
Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b).....	29, 30

Treatises

4 Newberg on Class Actions, § 11:22	12
4 Newberg on Class Actions, § 11:41	18
4 Newberg on Class Actions, § 11:50	13
Manual for Complex Litigation (Fourth) §§ 21.63 <i>et seq.</i> (Fed. Jud. Center 2004)	12

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiffs respectfully seek final approval of the preliminarily approved class action Settlement, which if approved resolves claims alleged in a number of class actions against Defendant Sirius XM Radio Inc. (“Sirius XM”). These actions result from Sirius XM’s sale of “Lifetime Subscriptions” to its satellite radio service, which lasted not for the lifetime of the consumers who purchased them (as plaintiffs alleged they should have done), but for the lifetime of the particular Device such consumers first used to receive the service and, up to three more Devices thereafter with a \$75 transfer fee for each transfer between Devices (which Sirius XM asserts was consistent with its marketing and written subscriber agreement over the years).

The Settlement achieves a “Lifetime Subscription” for Settlement Class Members (“Class Members”) that can actually last for their lifetime, as opposed to a maximum to the lifetime of four Devices. (Settlement Agreement (“SA”) ¶¶ 66-68.) Pursuant to the Settlement, Class Members with Active Lifetime Subscriptions will be able to transfer them to an unlimited number of different Devices, for a charge of \$35 per transfer (a significant reduction from Defendant’s \$75 per transfer fee). (*Id.* ¶ 66(a).)

Some Class Members no longer have Active Subscriptions. Those Class Members will have the option of reactivating their Lifetime Subscriptions (at no charge) and receive the benefits described above, or claiming \$100 in cash. (*Id.* ¶ 67.) Finally, and in addition, Internet streaming of Sirius XM’s radio service will be made available to Inactive Lifetime Subscribers who choose to reactivate, with no additional fee paid to Sirius XM (Internet streaming is already available to Active Lifetime Subscribers at no additional fee paid to Sirius XM). (*Id.* ¶ 66(c).)

Plaintiffs’ expert, Christian Tregillis, opines that the Settlement’s benefits are worth approximately \$96.4 million. (Declaration of Christian Tregillis (“Tregillis Decl.”), ECF 69-9 ¶ 35.) The terms of this Settlement are not only fair, reasonable, and adequate, as required for approval under the Federal Rules, but represent an achievement

1 that most likely is better than any result Plaintiffs could hope to achieve through
 2 continued litigation of these actions, were they to certify a class and make it to trial
 3 before a court — no mean feat, particularly given that this Court previously compelled
 4 the earliest filed of these actions to individual arbitration under the terms of Defendant’s
 5 alleged subscriber agreement. *See Wright v. Sirius XM Radio, Inc.*, No. 16-01688 JVS
 6 (“*Wright*”), ECF 59.

7 The Settlement was achieved after four years of hard-fought litigation, in this
 8 Court on behalf of Plaintiffs Alvarez and Wright (in this Action and in *Wright*), as well
 9 as in two other trial courts on behalf of Plaintiffs Bettison and Vaughn, and in the Ninth
 10 Circuit Court of Appeals after Wright appealed this Court’s order compelling individual
 11 arbitration of his claims. The Settlement is the result of extensive arms’-length
 12 negotiations overseen by Judge Carl West (Ret.), a respected and experienced JAMS
 13 mediator and former California Superior Court Judge.

14 The Court preliminarily approved the proposed Settlement and the Settlement’s
 15 proposed Notice Plan on July 15, 2020. (Order Regarding Motion for Preliminary
 16 Approval of Class Action Settlement (“Prelim. App. Order”), ECF 75.) Notice was
 17 successfully disseminated to Class Members who had an overwhelmingly positive
 18 reaction to the Settlement. By this Motion, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court
 19 conduct a final review of the Settlement, and approve the Settlement as fair, reasonable,
 20 and adequate.¹

21 The Settlement Administrator has implemented the robust, multi-pronged Notice
 22 Plan, and the user-friendly claims process which the Court approved.

23 The reaction from Class Members is resoundingly positive. As of December 11,
 24 2020, 6,210 Class Members with Inactive Subscriptions (and thus eligible to submit
 25 Claims) submitted Claim Forms (the Claims Deadline is January 12, 2021). (*See*
 26 concurrently filed Declaration of Robert Ahdoot (“Ahdoot Decl.”) ¶ 8.) In contrast, out

27 ¹ Unless otherwise specified herein, all capitalized terms and phrases have the same
 28 meaning as in the Definitions, Section II, of the Settlement Agreement. (ECF 68.)

1 of the hundreds of thousands of potential Class Members (98.3% of whom Epiq
2 successfully delivered Notice to), only 37 persons opted out and there were only 5
3 objections.

4 For the foregoing reasons and the others detailed below, the Settlement meets the
5 standards for final settlement approval and should be approved.

6 **II. BACKGROUND**

7 **A. Factual and Procedural History**

8 The proposed Settlement resolves three separate class action lawsuits against
9 Sirius XM under the captions *Vaugh v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.*, No. 1:18-cv-10331-NLH-
10 AMD (D.N.J.) (“*Vaugh*”), *Alvarez v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.*, No. 2:18-cv-08605-JVS-SS
11 (C.D. Cal.) (“*Alvarez*”), and *Bettison v Sirius XM Radio Inc.*, 3:18-cv-01065-PK (D. Or.)
12 (“*Bettison*”), as well as the individual claim of Wright in the fourth class action entitled
13 *Wright v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.*, No. 8:16-cv-01688-JVS-JCG (C.D. Cal.) (“*Wright*”),
14 which was dismissed by the Court of Appeals at oral argument when the Parties
15 announced the Settlement.²

16 Wright, filed the earliest of the actions in this Court. In response, Sirius XM filed
17 a motion to compel arbitration under the terms of Sirius XM’s subscriber agreement (*see*
18 *e.g.* Declaration of Catherine Petras (“*Petras Decl.*”), Ex. A, Customer Agreement
19 (*Wright*, ECF 32-3). After two rounds of briefing, the Court granted the motion to
20 compel arbitration and dismissed the *Wright* matter without prejudice so as not to
21 adversely affect an arbitration. (*Wright*, ECF 59.) The Court also denied leave to amend
22 the complaint to add additional class representatives because the addition of “new class
23 representatives would not change the result.” (*Id.*) The Customer Agreement enforced
24 by this Court also contained the following provisions regarding programming and
25 transfer fees:

26
27 ² For a detailed account of the factual and procedural history of this matter and the
28 work performed by Class Counsel, *see* Motion for Preliminary Approval, ECF 69; Motion
for Attorneys’ Fees, ECF 83 and supporting Declaration of Robert Ahdoot (“*Ahdoot Fee*
Decl.”), ECF 83-1, all of which are incorporated by reference.)

1 **1. GENERAL.**

2 **a) Programming.** The Service consists of a wide variety of music, sports,
3 news, talk, children's and other entertainment programming. Many different
4 and changing considerations affect the availability, cost and quality of
5 programming and customer demand for it. Accordingly, we reserve the
6 unrestricted right to change, rearrange, add, or delete programming,
7 including canceling, moving or adding particular channels, and our prices, at
8 any time, with or without notice to you. ... If you do not cancel your
9 Subscription within 30 days of a change, your continued receipt of the
10 Service will constitute your acceptance of such changes.

11 **4. Transfer Fee:** If you wish to transfer your Subscription to a different
12 SIRIUS Receiver during the term of a prepaid subscription or committed
13 subscription period, we may charge you a transfer fee of up to \$75.00.

14 (Petras Decl., Ex. A (*Wright* ECF 32-3); *see also, id.* Exs. D, I, & F (*Wright* ECF 32-6,
15 32-8, & 32-11) and Declaration of Patrick Donnelly filed concurrently herewith
16 (“Donnelly Decl.”), Exs. A - E (various versions of Sirius XM’s Customer Agreement
17 all of which contain the same or substantially similar provisions).

18 **B. The Parties Engaged in Extensive Settlement Negotiations**

19 In Spring of 2017, counsel for Plaintiff Wright began exploring the possibility of
20 resolution and engaging a mediator. The Parties held an in-person settlement conference
21 with counsel for Sirius XM at the Jones Day office in New York, but despite a number
22 of follow up conversations, a resolution did not occur at that time. (Ahdoot Fee Decl. ¶
23 22.) Nevertheless, these initial conversations laid the groundwork for future resolution
24 discussions, and Plaintiffs’ Counsel expended significant time and resources during the
25 initial talks, including hard-fought negotiation of informal discovery and review of the
26 documents Sirius XM agreed to produce pursuant to those resolution efforts. (*Id.* ¶ 23.)

27 On June 28, 2017, shortly before Plaintiffs Alvarez, Bettison, and Vaughn filed
28 their cases, Plaintiff Wright appealed this Court’s order granting Defendant’s motion to
dismiss and to compel arbitration of his claims. (9th Cir. Case No. 17-55928 (the
“Appeal”).) Thereafter, the Parties filed their opening, response, and reply briefs in the
Appeal. (*Id.* ECF 11, 21, 23.) While that appeal and the other Plaintiffs’ claims were
pending, and after all briefing in the Appeal was submitted, on November 29, 2018, the

1 Parties participated in a full-day mediation session before the Honorable Carl J. West
2 (Ret.). (Ahdoot Fee Decl. ¶ 28.)

3 At Plaintiffs' counsel's request, Defendant provided substantial information in
4 advance of mediation, sufficient to enable Plaintiffs' counsel to value the claims and
5 damages and understand the prospective Class's composition. (*Id.* ¶ 29.) This
6 information, and the Parties' prior investigations, litigation, and briefing, gave Plaintiffs'
7 counsel an understanding of the claims and defenses sufficient to meaningfully conduct
8 informed settlement discussions. (*Id.*)

9 The Settlement was not reached at the November 29, 2018 mediation. (*Id.* ¶ 31.)
10 Nonetheless, with the continued assistance of Judge West, after protracted and lengthy
11 negotiations, and on the morning of the oral argument before the Ninth Circuit in the
12 Appeal (after the Parties had checked in), on December 5, 2018, the Parties were able to
13 reach an agreement in principle. (*Id.* ¶ 32.) Accordingly, Plaintiff Wright moved to
14 dismiss his appeal at oral argument, and the Ninth Circuit did not rule on the appeal. (9th
15 Cir. Case No. 17-55928, ECF 38.)

16 The Parties then engaged in additional and extensive months-long negotiations,
17 through many telephone conferences, to finalize and memorialize all aspects of the
18 Settlement Agreement, including each of its many exhibits. (Ahdoot Fee Decl. ¶ 33.)

19 Even though Sirius XM is paying for Settlement administration in addition to the
20 benefits made available to the Class, the Parties held a competitive bidding process to
21 procure claims administration estimates from well-known administration companies, at
22 the conclusion of which the Parties selected Epiq Class Action & Claims Solutions, Inc.
23 ("Epiq"). (*Id.* ¶ 37.) The notice program and each document comprising the notice were
24 extensively negotiated and exhaustively refined, with input from experts at Epiq, to make
25 them easy to read and understand. (*Id.* ¶¶ 37-38; Declaration of Cameron Azari filed on
26 June 11, 2020, ECF 68-5.)

27 In addition to the Named Plaintiffs and Paul Wright, Class Counsel also
28 communicated the Settlement's terms to all of their many clients, who unanimously

1 expressed support. (Ahdoot Fee Decl. ¶ 40.) On June 5, 2020, after months of
 2 negotiations, the Parties executed the Settlement Agreement. (*Id.* ¶ 41.) At all times
 3 during settlement discussions, the negotiations were at arms' length. Furthermore, it was
 4 always the Named Plaintiffs' and Class Counsel's primary goal to achieve the maximum
 5 substantive relief possible for the Class.

6 **C. Preliminary Settlement Approval and Dissemination of Notice**

7 On June 11, 2020, Plaintiffs filed their Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class
 8 Action Settlement ("Motion for Preliminary Approval"), which included supporting
 9 documents, declarations, and exhibits. (ECF 69.) As discussed therein, in light of the
 10 fact that this Court ordered the matter to individual arbitration, the risk and uncertainty
 11 of the merits of the claim and class certification, and continued litigation, the Settlement
 12 is an outstanding result for the Settlement Class.

13 On July 15, 2020, the Court preliminarily approved the Settlement and ordered
 14 that the Class be given Notice. (Prelim. App. Order, ECF 75.) After the Court
 15 preliminarily approved the Settlement, the Parties continued to work with the Settlement
 16 Administrator to supervise dissemination of Notice to Class Members. (Ahdoot Fee
 17 Decl. ¶ 43.) These efforts included review and drafting of the language and format of the
 18 Settlement Website, the script for the automated response to the toll-free number, the
 19 language and format of the Settlement Class Notice forms, monitoring for exclusion
 20 requests and objections, and ensuring prompt response to each and every Class Member
 21 inquiry (whether by phone or e-mail) regarding the Settlement. (*Id.*)

22 Notice was successfully disseminated pursuant to the plan approved by the Court.
 23 As of December 10, 2020, a Postcard Notice or an Email Notice was delivered to
 24 838,772 Class Members. (Declaration of C. Azari on Implementation and Adequacy of
 25 Settlement Notice Plan ("2nd Azari Decl."), ECF 85 ¶¶ 10-18.) Epiq also successfully
 26 completed an Internet notice campaign (*id.* ¶¶ 19-20), the Settlement Website, toll-free
 27 number, and postal mailing address (*id.* ¶¶ 21-23). Individual direct notice and the
 28

internet campaign resulted in a notice of reach of approximately 98.3% of the identified Class Members. (*Id.* ¶¶ 8, 13, 31.)

III. THE SETTLEMENT

The Settlement provides substantial benefits to Class Members in exchange for the Release and is summarized below.³ (SA ¶¶ 66, 83-87.)

A. The Settlement Class

The Settlement Class is defined as:

All Persons in the United States who purchased a paid subscription from Sirius XM (or one of its predecessors) that was marketed as a “lifetime plan” or “lifetime subscription.” Excluded from the Class are: Sirius XM and its parents, subsidiaries, or any entities in which it has a controlling interest, as well as Sirius XM’s officers, directors, employees, affiliates, legal representatives, heirs, predecessors, successors, and assigns. Also excluded are any Judges to whom this case is assigned as well as their judicial staff and immediate family members.

(Prelim. App. Order, ECF 75 at p. 2; SA ¶ 33.)

The Settlement Class consists of hundreds of thousands of individuals. As of the execution date of the Settlement Agreement, there are approximately 838,000 Active Lifetime Subscriptions⁴ (“Active Subscribers”), and approximately 126,000 Inactive Lifetime Subscriptions⁵ (“Inactive Subscribers”). (SA ¶¶ 2, 19; *see also* SA Section I, Recitals.)

³ A more detailed description of the Settlement is set forth in the Preliminary Approval Motion (ECF 69) is incorporated herein.

⁴ An Active Lifetime Subscription is a Lifetime Subscription that, according to Sirius XM’s records, is associated with a Device that was activated to receive Sirius XM’s satellite radio service prior to June 5, 2020 and that continues to be authorized to receive the Sirius XM satellite radio service. (SA ¶ 2.)

⁵ An Inactive Lifetime Subscription is a Lifetime Subscription that, according to Sirius XM’s records, as of June 5, 2020, is no longer associated with a Device that was activated to receive Sirius XM’s satellite delivered radio service. A Settlement Class Member who previously had a Lifetime Subscription, but whose Lifetime Subscription was converted to a yearly, monthly, or some other subscription is deemed to have an Inactive Lifetime Subscription. (SA ¶ 19.)

1 **B. The Settlement Confers Substantial Benefits to Class Members**

2 Under the Settlement, Sirius XM agrees to: (1) allow Inactive Subscribers to
3 reactivate their Lifetime Subscriptions at no charge;⁶ (2) allow Active Subscribers and
4 Inactive Subscribers who have opted to reactivate their account (pursuant to this
5 Settlement) to transfer their Lifetime Subscriptions to other Devices an *unlimited*
6 number of times; (3) not charge more than \$35 for any transfer of a Lifetime Subscription
7 to other Devices (a reduction of the current fee of \$75 per transfer), and (4) provide
8 Inactive Subscribers who choose to reactivate with access to Sirius XM's Internet
9 streaming service at no cost (this feature is currently available to Active Lifetime
10 Subscribers). Inactive Subscribers may choose to forgo the relief above and, instead, be
11 paid a \$100 cash payment. Sirius XM has also agreed to pay for the costs of the
12 settlement notice and administration, court-approved attorneys' fees and expenses up to
13 \$3.5 million, and Service Payments for each Named Plaintiff and Paul Wright⁷ up to
14 \$5,000 each. (SA ¶¶ 45, 76-78.)

15 Active Subscribers will receive the benefits of the Settlement automatically. In
16 the event an Active Subscriber does not opt out, then he or she will be subject to the
17 releases set forth in the Settlement.

18 Inactive Subscribers must submit a Claim Form to obtain the Settlement's benefits
19 (i.e. reactivation of the Lifetime Subscription or a \$100 payment). (*Id.* ¶ 68(a) and Ex.
20 A (Claim Form).) Claim Forms may be submitted on-line (through the Settlement
21 Website) or by mail through January 12, 2021. In the event an Inactive Subscriber does
22 not submit a Claim Form, and does not opt out, then he or she will be subject to the

23 ⁶ Inactive Lifetime Subscribers who elect to cancel another paid Sirius XM
24 subscription at no charge when they reactivate their Lifetime Subscription will receive a
25 *pro rata* refund of any amounts paid for future service unless such paid subscription
26 purchased included bundled equipment. (SA ¶ 66(c)(i); Ex. B (Long Form Notice FAQ
8).)

27 ⁷ Pursuant to the Motion to Compel Arbitration, Wright was ordered to individual
28 arbitration. (*Wright*, ECF 59.) He dismissed the appeal from this Order after the material
settlement terms were reached. Rather than pursuing arbitration, however, Wright will
participate in the Settlement, albeit not as a Class Representative. In addition to the
Settlement, Wright also agreed to a Covenant Not to Sue Sirius XM. (SA ¶ 91, Ex. H.)

1 releases set forth in the Settlement. Class Members have been provided an opportunity
2 to determine whether they have either Inactive Lifetime Subscriptions or Active Lifetime
3 Subscriptions (as of the Settlement date) *via* a link on the Settlement Website’s landing
4 page entitled “Verify Account”. (*Id.* ¶ 51.)

5 Defendant offered Lifetime Subscriptions for prices ranging from \$357.54 to
6 \$755.00. (Ahdoot Fee Decl. ¶ 29; Tregillis Decl. ¶ 21 & Ex. B.) Given their relatively
7 high cost and value, the value of each Lifetime Subscription that no longer expires, or
8 that is reactivated, pursuant to the terms of the Settlement, is significant. (Tregillis Decl.
9 ¶¶ 18-36.) In addition, the reduction of the Device transfer fee from \$75 to \$35 – for at
10 least the approximately 838,000 active accounts (and the reactivating Inactive
11 Subscribers) – increases the value of the Settlement significantly. Factoring all these data
12 points, Plaintiffs’ expert values the Settlement’s benefits at \$96.4 million (this valuation
13 does not include any amounts paid for Notice and Administration, Service Payments,
14 and Attorneys’ Fees and Expenses, all of which are to be paid by Sirius XM in addition
15 to benefits described above). (Tregillis Decl. ¶ 35.)

16 **C. Opt-Outs & Objections**

17 Class Members were provided an opportunity to opt out of, or object to, the
18 Settlement by doing so on or before November 30, 2020. (Prelim. App. Order, ECF 75
19 at 15.) Valid requests required information described in the Notice. (2nd Azari Decl., Ex.
20 4.) Class Members also were informed that they could object to the Settlement, and
21 informed about Class Counsel’s fee application and the requests for Service Payments.
22 (*Id.*, Exs. 3 & 4.) To be considered, a written, personally-signed objection had to be
23 mailed to the Settlement Administrator, Class Counsel, Defense Counsel, and the Court
24 to the addresses listed in the Notice and had to include the information prescribed by the
25 Notice. (SA ¶ 60; 2nd Azari Decl., Ex. 4.) Epiq reports that, as of December 10, 2020, 37
26 Class Members submitted valid requests for exclusion from the Class and 5 objections
27 to the Settlement. (2nd Azari Decl. ¶¶ 24-25.)
28

D. Payment of Settlement Administration Expenses, Service Payments, and Attorneys' Fees and Expenses

Class Counsel filed an application for an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs on November 16, 2020. (Plaintiffs' Motion For Attorneys' Fees and Expenses and for Service Payments ("Fee & Service Payment Motion"), ECF 83.) Class Counsel requested attorneys' fees in the amount of \$3,470,984.63, plus reimbursement of \$29,015.37 in litigation expenses.⁸ The Fee & Service Payment Motion also requested Service Payments of \$5,000 for each of the Class Representatives and Paul Wright. (*Id.*)

E. Release

If the Settlement is approved, Plaintiffs, Mr. Wright, and only Class Members who do not timely opt out or request exclusion from the Settlement Class will release Sirius XM from all claims "(a) that were asserted, or attempted to be asserted, or that could have been asserted, based on the facts alleged in the Cases, the Action and/or the Consolidated Class Action Complaint, or (b) that arise out of, relate to, or are in connection with the sale of Sirius XM's Lifetime Subscriptions, whether arising out of common law, state law, or federal law, whether by Constitution, statute, contract, common law, or equity, or (c) that arise out of, relate to, or are in connection with the administration of the Settlement (the "Released Claims")." (SA ¶ 83.) Thus, the release is limited and tailored only to apply to allegations in the actions.

IV. NOTICE WAS SUCCESSFULLY DISSEMINATED PURSUANT TO THE COURT-APPROVED NOTICE PLAN

Rule 23 of the FRCP directs that the best notice practicable under the circumstances must include "individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23. The Court-approved Notice Plan as designed and implement satisfied this requirement.

Class Members who were reasonably identifiable from the Defendant's records received Notice via an Email Notice or a Postcard Notice mailed via United States Postal

⁸ Sirius XM agreed to separately pay for any and all Settlement Administration Expenses, Service Payments, and Attorneys' Fees and Expenses. (SA ¶ 66(g).) Such payments will not reduce any of the benefits available to the Class.

1 Service (“USPS”) first class mail. (2nd Azari Decl. ¶ 7.) A Postcard Notice was mailed
 2 via USPS first class mail to all undeliverable Email Notices (with a physical mailing
 3 address) after several attempts to deliver the Email Notice. Overall, individual Notice
 4 reached approximately 98.3% of the Settlement Class. (*Id.* ¶¶ 7-8.)

5 Both individual mailed notice and email notice referred Class Members to the
 6 Settlement Website, at LifeTimeSiriusXMSettlement.com. There, Class Members are
 7 able to review the Long Form Notice, submit a claim, determine whether their Lifetime
 8 Subscription is Active or Inactive as of the date of the Settlement Agreement (*i.e.* June
 9 5, 2020), review key filings from the case docket (including all briefing regarding
 10 Settlement approval, attorneys’ fees, and the Court’s orders thereon), and review the
 11 answers to Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs). (*Id.* ¶¶ 12, 21.) The toll-free number
 12 also provided Settlement-related information. (*Id.* ¶ 21.) Altogether, the Notice Plan
 13 reached approximately 98.3% of potential Class Members. (*Id.* ¶¶ 8, 13, 31.) Finally, the
 14 requirements of 28 U.S.C. §1715 (“CAFA”) were met. (*Id.* ¶ 9 & Ex. 1.)

15 **V. THE RESPONSE FROM THE CLASS IS OVERWHELMINGLY**
 16 **POSITIVE**

17 The deadline for Class Members to opt-out or object to the Settlement was
 18 November 30, 2020. As of December 10, 2020, only 37 persons submitted valid requests
 19 for exclusion from the Settlement and a total of 5 objections. Together, these individuals
 20 represent a minuscule percentage (far less than 1%) of the Class. By contrast, as of
 21 December 11, 2020, 6,210 Claim Forms were submitted by Class Members with Inactive
 22 Lifetime Subscriptions. (Ahdoot Decl. ¶ 8.) As of December 10, 2020, there have been
 23 101,182 unique visitors to the Settlement website and 386,874 website pages presented.
 24 (2nd Azari Decl. ¶ 21.) Moreover, Class Counsel have communicated with numerous
 25 Class Members who contacted Class Counsel with questions regarding the Settlement:
 26 all such individuals expressed support for the Settlement. (*Id.* ¶ 22; Ahdoot Decl. ¶¶ 7,9.)
 27 In addition, as of December 10, 2020, the toll-free number has handled 11,243 calls
 28 representing 37,663 minutes of use, and Epiq has received 220 pieces of correspondence

1 and 5,097 emails. (2nd Azari Decl. ¶¶ 22-23.) Out of all of these individuals, only 37
 2 persons opted out and 5 objected. Thus, Class Members supported this Settlement in
 3 overwhelming numbers.

4 **VI. THE COURT SHOULD GRANT FINAL APPROVAL OF THE** 5 **SETTLEMENT**

6 **A. The Class Action Settlement Approval Process**

7 Proceedings under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 have led to a defined three-
 8 step procedure for approval of class action settlements:

- 9 (1) Certification of a settlement class and preliminary approval of
 10 the proposed settlement after submission to the Court of a written
 motion for preliminary approval.
- 11 (2) Dissemination of notice of the proposed settlement to the
 12 affected class members.
- 13 (3) A formal fairness hearing, or final settlement approval hearing,
 14 at which evidence and argument concerning the fairness,
 adequacy, and reasonableness of the settlement are presented.

15 Manual for Complex Litigation (Fourth) §§ 21.63 *et seq.* (Fed. Jud. Center 2004). This
 16 procedure safeguards Class Members' procedural due process rights and enables the
 17 Court to fulfill its role as guardian of class interests. 4 Newberg on Class Actions, §
 18 11:22 *et seq.* (4th ed. 2002) (hereinafter "Newberg").

19 The Court completed the first step in the settlement approval process when it
 20 issued the Preliminary Approval Order on July 15, 2020 (Prelim. App. Order, ECF 75),
 21 and the second step—dissemination of Notice to Class Members—has been
 22 implemented by the Settlement Administrator. (2nd Azari Decl. ¶¶ 10-25.) By this
 23 Motion, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court take the third and final step and
 24 grant final approval of the Settlement.

25 **B. Final Approval of the Settlement is Appropriate**

26 Public policy "strong[ly] . . . favors settlements, particularly where complex class
 27 action litigation is concerned." *In re Syncor ERISA Litig.*, 516 F.3d 1095, 1101 (9th Cir.
 28 2008).

1 In weighing final approval of a class settlement, the Court's role is to determine
 2 whether the settlement, taken as a whole, is fair, reasonable, and adequate. *Staton v.*
 3 *Boeing Co.*, 327 F.3d 938, 952 (9th Cir. 2003). The Ninth Circuit has established a list
 4 of factors to consider when assessing whether a proposed settlement is fair, reasonable
 5 and adequate: (1) the strength of the plaintiffs' case; (2) the risk, expense, complexity,
 6 and likely duration of further litigation; (3) the risk of maintaining class action status
 7 throughout the trial; (4) the benefits offered in the settlement; (5) the extent of discovery
 8 completed and the stage of the proceedings; (6) the experience and views of counsel; (7)
 9 the presence of a governmental participant; and (8) the reaction of the class members to
 10 the proposed settlement. *Churchill Village*, 361 F.3d at 575; *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1026.
 11 Application of these factors here supports the conclusion that the Settlement is
 12 fundamentally fair, reasonable, and adequate, and should be finally approved.

13 **1. The Strength of Plaintiffs' Case and the Risk, Expense, Complexity,**
 14 **and Likely Duration of Further Litigation Weigh in Favor of**
 15 **Settlement**

16 When evaluating the strength of a plaintiff's case, a court should assess the
 17 plaintiff's likelihood of success on the merits and the range of possible recovery.
 18 *Rodriguez v. West Publishing Corp.*, 563 F.3d 948, 964-965 (9th Cir. 2009). The Court
 19 is not required to "reach any ultimate conclusions on the contested issues of fact and law
 20 which underlie the merits of the dispute, for it is the very uncertainty of the outcome in
 21 litigation and avoidance of wasteful and expensive litigation that induce consensual
 22 settlements." *Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Com'n of City and County of S.F.*, 688
 23 F.2d 615, 625 (9th Cir. 1982).

24 The Settlement here appropriately balances the costs, risks, and likely delay of
 25 further litigation, on the one hand, against the benefits provided, on the other hand. 4
 26 Newberg § 11:50 at 155 ("In most situations, unless the settlement is clearly inadequate,
 27 its acceptance and approval are preferable to lengthy and expensive litigation with
 28 uncertain results."). While Plaintiffs are confident in the strength of their claims, they
 also recognize that they would have to overcome significant obstacles to succeed.

1 Here, the Class faced the very real possibility that Sirius XM's arbitration
2 agreements and class action waivers would be found valid and enforceable. Had the case
3 continued in litigation, Sirius XM's arbitration policy and class action waiver likely
4 would have prevented Class Members from proceeding in court, or as a class action,
5 effectively eliminating the possibility of any comparable result. Because the case could
6 perish, as demonstrated by this Court's ruling that compelled the earliest filed of these
7 actions to individual arbitration under the terms of Sirius XM's alleged subscriber
8 agreement (*Wright*, ECF 59 & ECF 32-3, Petras Decl. Ex. A), Class Counsel's
9 achievement on behalf of the Class is extraordinary.

10 Moreover, various subscriber agreements produced by Sirius XM – which were
11 allegedly applicable to many members of the putative Class alleged in the Complaint -
12 contained provisions that the Lifetime Subscriptions were limited to the lifetime of the
13 initial Device and three transfers, as opposed to the lifetime of the subscriber. (*See e.g.*
14 Petras Decl., Ex. A (*Wright* ECF 32-3); Donnelly Decl. Exs. A - C). While Plaintiffs
15 would have, *inter alia*, argued against the applicability of such provisions, given the
16 allegedly uniform marketing regarding Lifetime Subscriptions, such contractual
17 provisions were likely to provide Sirius XM possible strong defenses to the actions.

18 Given the heavy obstacles and inherent risks Plaintiffs face with respect to their
19 claims and even getting to trial — the substantial benefits the Settlement provides favor
20 its approval.

21 **2. Plaintiffs Face the Challenge of Maintaining Class Action Status** 22 **Leading up to and Through Trial**

23 If litigation continues in this Court, Defendants will dispute that common issues
24 of fact and law prevail for class certification, and that a class trial is manageable. While
25 Plaintiffs believe they have a strong argument for certifying litigation classes here,
26 obtaining and maintaining class action status leading up to and throughout the trial is
27 always a challenge, and is far from guaranteed in a complex case like this one.

3. The Benefits Conferred by the Settlement are Substantial

Through this Settlement, Class Members will get substantial benefits from the Lifetime Subscriptions Plaintiffs always contended they were owed. Active Subscribers, as well as those Inactive Subscribers who choose to reactivate those subscriptions, will be able to transfer their Lifetime Subscriptions to different Devices an unlimited number of times, at a reduced price of \$35, which is less than half of the \$75 Defendant currently charges for the three transfers it allows under its current alleged terms and conditions.

In contrast to zero, which is what Class Members well might receive had the case continued to litigation, Plaintiffs' expert opines that the Settlement's benefits are worth approximately \$96,400,000. (Tregillis Decl. ¶ 35.) This demonstrates the extraordinary nature of the relief provided to the Class under this Settlement. Accordingly, this factor weighs heavily in favor of final approval.

4. Class Counsel Performed Sufficient Discovery, Research, and Analysis to Adequately Assess the Settlement and the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Class's Claims

This factor evaluates whether the parties have sufficient information to make an informed decision with respect to the settlement. *In re Mego Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 213 F.3d 454, 459 (9th Cir. 2000). "In the context of class action settlements, as long as the parties have sufficient information to make an informed decision about settlement, formal discovery is not a necessary ticket to the bargaining table." *Bellinghausen v. Tractor Supply Co.*, 306 F.R.D. 245, 257 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (internal quotation omitted). "Rather, the court's focus is on whether the parties carefully investigated the claims before reaching a resolution." *Id.* (internal quotation omitted).

This factor weighs heavily in favor of approving the Settlement here. As explained in more detail in the Motion for Attorneys' Fees and Expenses (ECF 83) and supporting Declaration of Robert Ahdoot (ECF 83-1), Class Counsel conducted extensive factual investigation in this matter, including, *inter alia*: significant pre-filing investigations, which included detailed review and evaluation of the facts, including a thorough and exhaustive investigation of issues related to Sirius XM's representations, advertising,

1 marketing, business practices, and promotional efforts and comprehensive research and
2 analysis of the applicable law, including those relating to Sirius XM's arbitration
3 provisions. (Ahdoot Fee Decl. ¶ 12.) Class Counsel interviewed, and conducted a
4 detailed vetting of hundreds of affected Class Members, with whom they communicated
5 throughout the course of the litigation. (*Id.* ¶ 13.) In all phases of the litigation, Class
6 Counsel endeavored to gain an ample understanding of the legal issues underlying
7 Plaintiffs' claims. (*Id.* ¶ 14.)

8 The breadth of information gleaned from their extensive discovery and
9 investigation efforts allowed Class Counsel to weigh the likely success of Plaintiffs'
10 claims and estimate individual damages associated with Plaintiffs' claims. (*Id.* ¶ 15.)
11 This necessary work also allowed Class Counsel to proceed forward in a collaborative
12 manner and formulate a litigation strategy aimed at obtaining meaningful relief for the
13 Class as efficiently as possible. (*Id.* ¶ 16.) Although the *Wright* action did not proceed
14 far into the discovery period, given this Court's ruling on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss
15 and to Compel Arbitration, that action was intensely litigated in this Court and in the
16 Ninth Circuit before the Settlement finally was reached. Ultimately, Defendant disclosed
17 substantial evidence under mediation privilege, and thus the extent of discovery
18 completed is more extensive than the stage of proceedings alone might suggest. (Ahdoot
19 Fee Decl. ¶ 12.) Class Counsel thoroughly reviewed materials provided by Sirius XM in
20 advance of mediation, conducted further research and analysis, and consulted with
21 several experts prior to and during Settlement negotiations that lasted multiple months.

22 Accordingly, Plaintiffs and Class Counsel had sufficient information to make an
23 informed decision about the Settlement and to determine that it represented a favorable
24 and fair result for the Class Members.

25 **5. The Recommendations of Experienced Class Counsel Favor Final** 26 **Approval**

27 "Great weight is accorded to the recommendation of counsel, who are most
28 closely acquainted with the facts of the underlying litigation . . . because parties

1 represented by competent counsel are better positioned than courts to produce a
 2 settlement that fairly reflects each party's expected outcome in the litigation." *Nat'l*
 3 *Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.*, 221 F.R.D. 523, 528 (C.D. Cal. 2004); *see*
 4 *also Rodriguez*, 563 F.3d at 697 ("Parties represented by competent counsel are better
 5 positioned than courts to produce a settlement that fairly reflects each party's outcome
 6 in litigation.").

7 Plaintiffs are represented by attorneys who have extensive experience litigating
 8 and serving as counsel in numerous consumer class actions, and other complex matters,
 9 including cases regarding unfair business practice claims and false advertising claims.
 10 (Ahdoot Fee Decl. ¶¶ 65-75 & Ex. A; Dubanevich Fee Decl. ¶¶ 22-26; Dukelow Fee
 11 Decl. ¶ 2 & Ex. A.) Class Counsel identified and investigated the claims in this lawsuit,
 12 vigorously prosecuted this action and will continue to do so through final approval. Class
 13 Counsel's substantial skill, expertise, and experience were critical to achieving the
 14 Settlement here. They fully endorse the Settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate and
 15 in the best interests of the Class. (Ahdoot Fee Decl. ¶¶ 10-17; Dubanevich Fee Decl. ¶¶
 16 17, 22-26; Dukelow Fee Decl. ¶ 3.)

17 **6. No Presence of a Government Participant**

18 Notice has been issued pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act, 28 U.S.C. §
 19 1715. (2nd Azari Decl. ¶ 9 & Ex. 1.) No governmental entity has intervened.

20 **7. The Class Response Favors Final Approval**

21 The reaction of the Class weighs in favor of the Settlement. Notwithstanding the
 22 fact that Notice reached approximately 98.3% of the 853,256 identified Class Members,
 23 only 37 persons opted out the Settlement, and only 5 objections were submitted. (2nd
 24 Azari Decl. ¶¶ 24-25.) This *de minimus* opt-out and objection rate shows the
 25 overwhelmingly positive response to the Settlement. In addition, Class Counsel have
 26 communicated with numerous Class Members who contacted Class Counsel with
 27 questions regarding the Settlement: all such individuals expressed support for the
 28 Settlement. (2nd Azari Decl. ¶¶ 21-23; Ahdoot Decl. ¶ 9.)

8. Lack of Collusion Between the Parties

“Before approving a class action settlement, the district court must reach a reasoned judgment that the proposed agreement is not the product of fraud or overreaching by, or collusion among, the negotiating parties.” *City of Seattle*, 955 F.2d at 1290 (citations omitted). “Where a settlement is the product of arms-length negotiations conducted by capable and experienced counsel, the court begins its analysis with a presumption that the settlement is fair and reasonable.” *Garner v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, No. 08-cv-1365-CW, 2010 WL 1687832, at *13 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2010); *see also* 4 Newberg § 11:41; *In re Heritage Bond Litig.*, No. 02-ml-1475-DT, 2005 WL 1594403, at *2 (C.D. Cal. June 10, 2005).

Evidence of a settlement negotiation process involving protracted negotiations with the assistance of a neutral mediator also weighs in favor of approval. *Rosales v. El Rancho Farms*, No. 1:09-cv-00707-AWI-JLT, *slip op.* at *44 (E.D. Cal. July 21, 2015) (“Notably, the Ninth Circuit has determined the ‘presence of a neutral mediator [is] a factor weighing in favor of a finding of non-collusiveness.’”) (quoting *In re Bluetooth Headset Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 654 F.3d 935, 948 (9th Cir. 2011)); *Pierce v. Rosetta Stone, Ltd.*, No. C 11-01283 SBA, 2013 WL 5402120, at *15-16 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2013) (“participation of mediator is not dispositive, but is ‘a factor weighing in favor of a finding of non-collusiveness’”).

The Settlement is the product of hard-fought, arms-length negotiations between the Parties and their well-qualified counsel. Here, there are no indicia of collusion.

When negotiations began, Plaintiffs had a clear view of the strengths and weaknesses of their case and were in a strong position to make an informed decision regarding the reasonableness of a potential settlement. The Parties engaged in extensive arm’s length negotiations, including a full-day mediation session and extensive negotiations after that, with the assistance of Judge West. (Ahdoot Fee Decl. ¶ 28.)

Throughout these negotiations, the Parties were represented by counsel experienced in the prosecution, defense and settlement of complex class actions. Thus,

1 the Settlement is presumptively fair and reasonable.

2 **VII. THE OBJECTIONS**

3 The response of the Class to the Settlement is overwhelmingly positive. As
4 described above, the Notice Plan (which achieved a 98.3% reach) generated thousands
5 of positive responses and 6,210 claims (as of December 11, 2020), but only 37 opt-outs
6 and 5 objections. The objections were interposed by (i) Yves A. Doublette, (ii) Adam R.
7 Klock, (iii) Mark E. Raabe, (iv) Joshua A. Sauberman, and (v) Tim Zeichert. (Ahdoot
8 Decl. Exs. A-E.)

9 **A. The Small Number of Objections – Five – Is Compelling Evidence that** 10 **the Settlement Is Fair, Reasonable, and Adequate**

11 The number of class members that object to a settlement generally is considered
12 in determining whether the settlement is fair, reasonable, and adequate. *Mandujano v.*
13 *Basic Vegetable Prods. Inc.*, 541 F.2d 832, 837 (9th Cir. 1976). “It is established that
14 the absence of a large number of objections to a proposed class action settlement raises
15 a strong presumption that the terms of a proposed class settlement action are favorable
16 to the class members.” *Nat’l Rural Telecomms. Coop. v. DIRECTV, Inc.*, 221 F.R.D. at
17 529; *Moore v. Verizon Commc’ns Inc.*, No. C 09-1823 SBA, 2013 WL 4610764, at *9
18 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2013) (same); *In re Omnivision Techs., Inc.*, 559 F. Supp. 2d 1036,
19 1043 (N.D. Cal. 2008) (same); *see also Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1027 (“fact that the
20 overwhelming majority of the class willingly approved the offer and stayed in the class
21 presents at least some objective positive commentary as to its fairness”). The substance
22 of each objection here is addressed below. Aside from their lack of merit, however, the
23 small number of objections is another indication that the Settlement is fair, reasonable,
24 and adequate.⁹

25
26
27 ⁹ An extensive empirical review determined that the average number of objections
28 to settlements of consumer class actions is 233. Theodore Eisenberg & Geoffrey Miller,
The Role of Opt-Outs and Objectors in Class Action Litigation: Theoretical and
Empirical Issues, 57 Vand. L. Rev. 1529, 1550 (2004) By any measure, the number of
objections received here is remarkably low.

B. The Objections Are Without Merit And Should Be Overruled

Though Class Counsel appreciate the comments made by the objectors, respectfully, all objections lodged against the Settlement are without merit, based on incorrect facts, comprise of opinions and conclusions, provide no legal authority, and should be overruled.

1. Objections That The Settlement Is Somehow Inadequate Have No Merit Because The Settlement's Benefits Are Excellent And Certainly Fair, Reasonable, And Adequate

Though seemingly discrete to each person's circumstances, all of the objectors here essentially argue that the Settlement's consideration is not sufficient.

- Klock objects on the basis that the “satellite radio programming content currently being delivered to lifetime subscription holders such as [Klock] does not comply with the initial lifetime subscription product offering.” Klock asks to “mandate restoration of lifetime subscriber access (via radio and online) to any and all Sirius XM programming currently available, which also existed at any point during which the lifetime subscription product was offered.” (Ahdoot Decl. Ex. B (Klock) at p. 1.)
- Zeichert objects that he is not “receiving the subscription package I agreed to and paid for” and requests that counsel “clarify the language” of “Paragraph 66(a)” of the Settlement Agreement “to provide for Sirius Lifetime Subscribers a return to their original programming.” (Ahdoot Decl. Ex. E (Zeichert) at p. 2.)
- Doublette is likewise unsatisfied with the relief provided by the Settlement. (Doublette at p. 1) (“This Settlement . . . does not satisfy me.”). Doublette thinks that “[n]ot even the \$100 payment is good enough” because he “paid \$789.49 for the Lifetime Subscription and was never told that the subscription was not for [his] lifetime.” Doublette also complains that he has been paying \$22.11 per month since 2013, while holding a lifetime subscription.” Doublette requests to be reimbursed \$10,000 for the payments made and that his subscription be transferred “at no charge.” (Ahdoot Decl. Ex. A (Doublette) at p. 1.)
- Raabe objects to the Settlement “in part.”¹⁰ Raabe argues that “members are still required to pay a transfer fee – albeit a lower fee than originally stated” and

¹⁰ Raabe states: “The objectionable portion of the Settlement is the absence of the Court's review regarding possible violation of consumer protection laws by the Defendant, Sirius XM Radio Inc.,” (Ahdoot Decl. Ex. C (Raabe) at p. 2.) Raabe does

1 that under the Settlement's terms, "Defendant simply agrees to provide
2 subscriptions members 'most' of the services that were originally advertised."
(Ahdoot Decl. Ex. C (Raabe) at p. 4.)

- 3 ■ Sauberman argues that (i) the "agreement unjustly enriches the Defendant.
4 Defendant failed to disclose the existence of any transfer fee at the time of
5 subscription; having provided no written agreement upon purchase. Further,
6 Defendant downgraded the number of channels lifetime subscribers would
7 receive when it introduced subscription packages...;" and (ii) the settlement
8 does not include "injunctive relief or prospective assurances[]" and "reduces
the improper assessments of similar surcharge to simply a cost of doing
business for Defendant." (Ahdoot Decl. Ex. D (Sauberman) at p. 1.)

9 *First*, all of these objectors were provided subscriber agreements at the time of
10 their purchase. (Donnelly Decl. ¶¶ 8-16 and Exs. A-E.) All were uniform in stating that
11 programming is subject to change (*see e.g. supra* Sec. II.A.) and all stated that Sirius
12 XM would charge a \$75 fee upon transfer from one Device to another. (*Id.*; Donnelly
13 Decl. Exs. A-E.) None of the objectors address the terms of the subscriber agreements,
14 or the fact that the Court enforced such terms in *Wright*. Given such provisions,
15 complaints that the Settlement does not include original programming or a transfer fee
16 albeit a lower one are not substantiated or valid.

17 *Second*, programming for the Lifetime Subscriptions (as well as for all
18 subscribers) has changed, with new stations being added since these objectors purchased
19 their subscriptions and with licensing requirements. (Donnelly Decl. ¶¶ 3-6.) Subscribers
20 now, for example, can enjoy the Beatles Channel, as well as other programming
21 opportunities (at various times, moreover, Sirius XM has made available programming
22 on an interim basis, for example, a Billy Joel channel, *etc.*). (*Id.*) In the event the
23 Settlement forced the same programming available when Class Members first purchased
24 their subscriptions would result in less programming and does not take in to account the
25 alleged terms and conditions of the agreement this Court enforced.

26
27
28 not address the procedural history or legal merits of the Litigation or identify the
consumer protection laws he claims were not reviewed.

1 *Third*, this case challenges Defendant’s refusal to honor Lifetime Subscriptions
 2 for the life of Class Members—an issue that was in dispute given alleged promises made
 3 in marketing of the subscription and some contractual language. The actions did not
 4 challenge Sirius XM’s alleged contractually-disclosed ability to modify Sirius XM’s
 5 satellite radio programming or channel offerings/line-ups in ways that, Sirius XM
 6 believed, enhanced the overall programming for all of its subscribers. Thus, Klock and
 7 Zeichert’s objections as to Sirius XM’s ability to change its programming (in particular,
 8 that certain channels previously included in their respective subscriptions prior to the
 9 Sirius and XM Radio merger were not carried over after the merger)¹¹ are not the subject
 10 of this Settlement, and do not undermine its fairness.

11 Lastly, Sauberman argues that “there is nothing in this agreement that prevents
 12 Defendant from engaging in this activity in the future (i.e. no injunctive relief or
 13 prospective assurances).” Sirius XM, however, no longer offers lifetime subscriptions.
 14 Beyond that, the Settlement obligates Sirius XM to “amend its Customer Agreement to
 15 reflect that Class Members with a Lifetime Subscription shall be entitled to transfer their
 16 Lifetime Subscriptions an *unlimited* number of times,” and to “not charge any fee for
 17 any transfer of a Lifetime Subscription that exceeds” \$35 per transfer. (SA ¶ 66.) The
 18 Settlement Agreement recites that “[e]ach Party represents and warrants that he, she, or
 19 it intends to be bound fully” by the terms of the Settlement (SA ¶ 100), and there is no
 20 reason to expect otherwise after final approval.

21 Here, all material terms of the Settlement, i.e. the Settlement relief, were
 22 negotiated at arm’s length, and were already found by this Court to be substantial “given
 23 the obstacles and inherent risks Plaintiffs face with respect to their claims.” (Prelim.
 24 App. Order, ECF 75 at p. 10.)

25
 26 ¹¹ (Klock: “Programming removed from lifetime subscriber access included, but was
 27 not limited to, “NFL Radio” (current channel 88) and was the primary reason for my
 28 purchase of the XM Radio products.”); (Zeichert: “The sole reason I decided to subscribe
 to Sirius instead of XM was because of the contract Sirius has with the NFL It was
 Sirius Radio’s contract with the NFL alone that persuaded me to become a Sirius
 Lifetime Subscriber.”).

1 While it is easy for someone to come and critique a settlement after the parties
 2 have reached a hard-fought compromise, a settlement need not be ideal in order to be
 3 approved. The mere fact that the benefits provided under the Settlement “does not
 4 satisfy” all class members or only compensates them for “most” but not all their
 5 damages, does not provide a sufficient basis upon which to conclude that
 6 the settlement agreement is unfair. *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1027 (“Of course it is possible,
 7 as many of the objectors' affidavits imply, that the settlement could have been better. But
 8 this possibility does not mean the settlement presented was not fair, reasonable or
 9 adequate. Settlement is the offspring of compromise; the question we address is not
 10 whether the final product could be prettier, smarter or snazzier, but whether it is fair,
 11 adequate and free from collusion”).¹²

12 These objections also appear to misperceive the Court's role at this stage: the Court
 13 may grant or deny approval of the Settlement, not revise its terms. Manual for Complex
 14 Litigation (4th) § 21.61 (2004) (“The judicial role in reviewing a proposed settlement is
 15 critical, but limited to approving the proposed settlement, disapproving it, or imposing
 16 conditions on it. The judge cannot rewrite the agreement.”).

17 Finally, all objectors had an opportunity to opt out of the Settlement. “Federal
 18 courts routinely hold that the opt-out remedy is sufficient to protect class members who
 19 are unhappy with the negotiated class action settlement terms.” *Eisen v. Porsche Cars*
 20 *N. Am., Inc.*, No. 2:11-cv-09405-CAS, 2014 WL 439006, at *7 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2014)

21
 22 ¹² See also, e.g., *Browne v. Am. Honda Motor Co.*, No. 09-cv-06750-MMM-DTB,
 23 2010 WL 9499072, at *18 (C.D. Cal. July 29, 2010) (“While the proposed settlement
 24 does not perfectly compensate every member of the class, it is unlikely that any ...
 25 settlement of the claims of a class of more than 740,000 members would achieve such a
 26 result. Despite the reasonable concerns raised by the objectors, the settlement represents
 27 a compromise that fairly compensates class members who chose to remain in the class”);
 28 *Glass v. UBS Fin. Servs., Inc.*, No. C-06-4068-MMC, 2007 WL 221862, at *6 (N.D. Cal.
 Jan. 26, 2007), *aff'd*, 331 F. App'x 452 (9th Cir. 2009) (“Settlements by their very nature
 are not intended to provide full compensation for the claimed losses and consequently
 cannot be calculated with the same precision as actual damages”); *Lane v. Facebook,*
Inc., 696 F.3d 811, 819 (9th Cir. 2012) (“As our precedents have made clear, whether a
 settlement is fundamentally fair within the meaning of Rule 23(e) is different from the
 question whether the settlement is perfect in the estimation of the reviewing court”
 (citation omitted)).

(collecting cases); *Amador v. Baca*, No. 2:10-cv-1649-SVW-JEM, 2020 WL 5628938, at *5 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 11, 2020) (“To the extent that these individuals feel that this settlement is inadequate, their proper remedy would be to opt-out, as a small number of other class members have done....”); *Milligan v. Toyota*, No. 3:09-cv-05418-RS, *slip op.* at 13 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2012) (overruling multiple objections to a class settlement, noting that objectors “could have simply opted out”). Thus, to the extent a Class Member was not satisfied with the benefits of the Settlement, they were free to opt out.

When the benefits of the Settlement are compared to the risks of zero gain, added expenses, and time and effort associated with continued litigation, it becomes clear the Settlement merits final approval and objections based on inadequacy of the Settlement’s terms or consideration should be overruled.

2. Notice To The Class Satisfies Due Process, the FRCP, And Was Executed In Accordance With The Court’s Order

Sauberman also challenges the notice in this case based on incorrect understanding of the Notice Plan stating that “[c]onsidering recent disruptions to the United States Mail, notice should also have been conveyed by electronic mail to class members.” Sauberman argues that this violates FRCP Rule 23(c)(2). This argument is clearly without merit.

First, direct notice of the Settlement was provided by email (with follow up physical US Mail for “bounced” emails) to every Class Member that Sirius XM identified in its records. (2nd Azari Decl. ¶¶ 11-12.) This Notice was also augmented by an internet notice campaign and publication. (*Id.* ¶¶ 19-21.) Overall, Notice reached 98.3% of the Class. (*Id.* ¶¶ 8, 13, 31 (Federal Judicial Center, “Judges’ Class Action Notice and Claims Process Checklist and Plain Language Guide” (2010) (recognizing the effectiveness of notice that reaches between 70 and 95 percent of the class)).) For example, Epiq sent an Email Notice to Sauberman on August 28, 2020, which was returned as undeliverable. Epiq then sent a Postcard Notice to Mr. Sauberman, which was not returned as undeliverable. (2nd Azari Decl. ¶ 25.)

FRCP Rule 23(c)(2) provides in relevant part: “...the court must direct to class members the best notice that is practicable under the circumstances, including individual notice to all members who can be identified through reasonable effort. The notice may be by one or more of the following: United States mail, electronic means, or other appropriate means.” The Notice Plan here precisely complied with this Rule. The Court-approved Notice Plan effectuated in this case was the best notice practicable and complied with due process as this Court has already found in the Preliminary Approval Order. (ECF 75 at pp. 16-17.)

3. The Requirements for Objecting Are Fair

Sauberman objects to the objection procedures approved by the Court. He argues: “The process for objecting is quite onerous. The long form notice requires that objections be sent to ...[Epiq, Class Counsel, and Defense Counsel]. It is unlikely most Settlement Class Members will know to look at the Settlement Agreement itself to locate such addresses, thereby discouraging objections.” Sauberman, however, misrepresents the contents of the long form notice which sets out each the addresses where objections should be sent. (2nd Azari Decl. Ex. 4, Long Form Notice ¶ 23.) This objection is without merit and should be overruled.

The Court's Preliminary Approval Order set forth the relevant objection procedures (ECF 75 at p. 6), which were disclosed in the Notice disseminated to Class Members. (2nd Azari Decl. ¶ 33 & Ex. 4.) The requirements imposed on objectors are consistent with Rule 23, are common features of class action settlements and are routinely enforced. *Beaver v. Tarsadia Hotels*, No. 11-cv-01842-GPC-KSC, 2017 WL 2268853, at *7 (S.D. Cal. May 24, 2017) (requiring class members to serve objections on counsel for plaintiffs’ and defendants); *Nitsch v. DreamWorks Animation SKG Inc.*, No. 14-cv-04062-LHK, 2017 WL 399221, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 19, 2017) (approving procedure requiring objections to be mailed to the addresses provided in the Notice).

Though Class Counsel appreciate the comments made by the objectors, respectfully, the five objections lodged against this Settlement are without merit. As

1 noted above, “the very essence of a settlement is compromise, a yielding of absolutes
 2 and an abandoning of highest hopes.” *Officers for Justice*, 688 F.2d at 624. The relevant
 3 question is “not whether the final [settlement] could be prettier, smarter or snazzier, but
 4 whether it is fair, adequate and free from collusion.” *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1027. While
 5 this Settlement may not have obtained the absolute maximum relief available under the
 6 law, settlements rarely do because they are compromises. The relevant standard is
 7 whether the Settlement is “fair, adequate and reasonable” which this Settlement meets.
 8 Thus, the Objections should be overruled.

9 **VIII. CLASS ACTION TREATMENT IS APPROPRIATE FOR THIS** 10 **SETTLEMENT**

11 “Parties seeking class certification must satisfy each of the four requirements of
 12 Rule 23(a) — numerosity, commonality, typicality, and adequacy[.]” *Briseno v.*
 13 *ConAgra Foods, Inc.*, 844 F.3d 1121, 1124 (9th Cir. 2017). In its Preliminary Approval
 14 Order, the Court found that the Class could be certified as defined in ¶ 33 of the
 15 Settlement Agreement and that the proposed Settlement Class met the requirements of
 16 notice. (ECF 75, pp. 12-17.) In doing so, the Court found that the Settlement Class
 17 Representatives satisfied both Rule 23(a) and (b)(3) requirements, and that Settlement
 18 Class Counsel were adequate representatives of the Class. (*Id.*) As demonstrated below,
 19 there is no reason for the Court to depart from its previous conclusion that certification
 20 of the Class is warranted, and no party argues otherwise.

21 **A. This Action Satisfies the Requirements of Rule 23(a)**

22 **1. The Class is Sufficiently Numerous**

23 Rule 23(a)(1) is satisfied when “the class is so numerous that joinder of all class
 24 members is impracticable.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1). Numerosity is generally satisfied
 25 when the class exceeds forty members. *Slaven v. BP Am., Inc.*, 190 F.R.D. 649, 654
 26 (C.D. Cal. 2000). “A specific minimum number is not necessary, and [a] plaintiff need
 27 not state the exact number of potential class members.” *Richie v. Blue Shield of Cal.*,
 28 No. 13-cv-2693-EMC, 2014 WL 6982943, at *15 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2014) (class of 140

members meets numerosity requirement). Here, the Class includes approximately hundreds of thousands of members dispersed across the United States. The sheer size and distribution of the Class renders joinder impracticable. *Palmer v. Stassinis*, 233 F.R.D. 546, 549 (N.D. Cal. 2006) (“Joinder of 1,000 or more co-plaintiffs is clearly impractical.”). Numerosity is established.

2. There Are Common Questions of Both Law and Fact

Rule 23(a)(2) “conditions class certification on demonstrating that members of the proposed class share common ‘questions of law or fact.’” *Stockwell v. City & County of San Francisco*, 749 F.3d 1107, 1111 (9th Cir. 2014). Courts routinely find commonality where the class’ claims arise from a defendant’s uniform course of conduct. *Spalding v. City of Oakland*, No. C11-2867 TEH, 2012 WL 994644, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 23, 2012) (finding commonality where plaintiffs “alleged a common course of conduct that is amenable to classwide resolution”).

Here, there are many common issues of law and fact that affect the Class uniformly and satisfy the commonality requirement, including: Whether Sirius XM breached its contract; the terms and conditions covering Defendant’s sale of Lifetime Subscriptions to Class Members; Defendant’s communication of those terms to Class Members; Defendant’s representations concerning its Lifetime Subscriptions; and whether Class Member’s claims are subject to individual arbitration. Accordingly, Rule 23’s commonality requirement is satisfied here.

3. The Class Representatives’ Claims Are Typical of Other Class Members’ Claims

“Rule 23(a)(3) requires that ‘the claims or defenses of the representative parties are typical of the claims or defenses of the class.’” *Parsons v. Ryan*, 754 F.3d 657, 685 (9th Cir. 2014). “Like the commonality requirement, the typicality requirement is ‘permissive’ and requires only that the representative’s claims are ‘reasonably co-extensive with those of absent class members; they need not be substantially identical.’” *Rodriguez v. Hayes*, 591 F.3d 1105, 1124 (9th Cir. 2010). “The test of typicality is

1 ‘whether other members have the same or similar injury, whether the action is based on
 2 conduct which is not unique to the named plaintiffs, and whether other class members
 3 have been injured by the same course of conduct.’” *Evon v. Law Offices of Sidney*
 4 *Mickell*, 688 F.3d 1015, 1030 (9th Cir. 2012). Plaintiffs’ and Class Members’ claims
 5 arise from the same nucleus of facts and are based on the same legal theory: whether
 6 Defendant’s conduct with respect to the Lifetime Subscriptions was unlawful. Typicality
 7 is therefore satisfied.

8 **4. Class Representatives and Class Counsel Fairly and Adequately** 9 **Protect the Interests of the Class**

10 Finally, Rule 23(a)(4) requires “the representative parties [to] adequately protect
 11 the interests of the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4). Courts engage in a dual inquiry to
 12 determine adequate representation and ask: “(1) do the named plaintiffs and their counsel
 13 have any conflicts of interest with other Class Members and (2) will the named plaintiffs
 14 and their counsel prosecute the action vigorously on behalf of the class?” *Hanlon*, 150
 15 F.3d at 1020. As the Court noted, there are no conflicts of interest here, as their claims
 16 are coextensive with those of the Class Members, both Active and Inactive Subscribers.
 17 (ECF 75 at p. 14.) Plaintiffs seek the same remedy as all Class Members: relief to address
 18 claims arising from Sirius XM’s sale of lifetime subscriptions. Plaintiffs’ interests are
 19 perfectly aligned with the interests of the Class. Further, proposed Class Counsel have
 20 extensive experience litigating and settling class actions, including false advertising,
 21 breach of contract, and unlawful business practices claims on behalf of consumers. They
 22 have demonstrated expertise in handling all aspects of complex litigation and class
 23 actions and are well qualified to represent the Class. (*See generally* ECF 83-1, Ahdoot
 24 Fee Decl.; ECF 83-2, Dubanevich Fee Decl.; ECF 83-2, Dukelow Fee Decl.)

25 **B. The Predominance and Superiority Requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) are** 26 **Satisfied**

27 In addition to the requirements of Rule 23(a), the Court must find that the
 28 provisions of Rule 23(b) are satisfied. The Court should certify a Rule 23(b)(3) class

1 when: (i) “questions of law or fact common to class members predominate over any
 2 questions affecting only individual members”; and (ii) a class action is “superior to other
 3 available methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.” Fed. R. Civ.
 4 P. 23(b)(3). This case satisfies both the predominance and superiority requirements.

5 **1. Common Issues of Law and Fact Predominate**

6 To satisfy Rule 23(b)(3), Plaintiffs must demonstrate that “common questions
 7 ‘predominate over any questions affecting only individual [class] members.’” *Amgen*
 8 *Inc. v. Conn. Ret. Plans & Trust Funds*, 133 S. Ct. 1184, 1196 (2013) (Rule 23(b)(3)
 9 “does not require a plaintiff seeking class certification to prove that each element of [the]
 10 claim is susceptible to classwide proof.”)

11 Here, the Complaint alleges a common law breach of contract cause of action for
 12 the nationwide class. The Complaint alleges that Sirius XM did not honor the terms of
 13 the Lifetime Subscriptions it sold to all Class Members. These common issues of law
 14 and fact include: the terms and conditions covering Sirius XM’s sale of Lifetime
 15 Subscriptions to Class Members; Sirius XM’s communication of those terms to Class
 16 Members; and whether Sirius XM breached the terms of its agreements regarding
 17 Lifetime Subscriptions.

18 Whether Defendant breached a contract with the Class Members—the sole cause
 19 of action in the Complaint—is a straightforward legal question that is common to all
 20 Class Members. Indeed, even if all fifty states’ law applies to the respective residents of
 21 those states, this question still predominates because the elements of this cause of action
 22 do not vary state-by-state in any significant respect. (ECF 69-1, Ahdoot Prelim. Decl. ¶
 23 24 and Ex. A, 50-State survey of breach of contract law).

24 **2. Class Treatment Is Superior in This Case**

25 Finally, under Rule 23(b)(3), a class action must be “superior to other available
 26 methods for fairly and efficiently adjudicating the controversy.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3).
 27 The Court evaluates whether a class action is a superior method of adjudicating
 28 plaintiff’s claims by evaluating four factors: “(1) the interest of each class member in

1 individually controlling the prosecution or defense of separate actions; (2) the extent and
2 nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by or against the
3 class; (3) the desirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular
4 forum; and (4) the difficulties likely to be encountered in the management of a class
5 action.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3).

6 Each of these factors supports certifying the Class for settlement purposes. There
7 is little interest or incentive for Class Members to individually control the prosecution
8 of separate actions. The Class Members’ individual claims are too small to justify the
9 potential litigation costs that would be incurred by prosecuting these claims individually.
10 Although Plaintiffs claim an injury resulting from Defendant’s conduct, the cost of
11 individually litigating such a case against Defendant would far exceed the value of any
12 relief that could be obtained by any one consumer. This fact strongly warrants a finding
13 that a class action is a superior method of adjudication. A class action also would be
14 superior because concentrating this litigation in one forum would not only prevent the
15 risk of inconsistent outcomes but would “reduce litigation costs and promote greater
16 efficiency.” *Negrete v. Allianz Life Ins. Co. of N. Am.*, 238 F.R.D. 482, 493 (C.D. Cal.
17 2006).

18 In evaluating the Settlement this Court already found that a class action is superior
19 to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy,
20 because “the judicial economy achieved through common adjudication undoubtedly
21 makes a class action superior to any alternative procedures for resolving the claims” of
22 millions of class members. (ECF 75.) This remains true for the Settlement, which
23 encompasses a Class of hundreds of thousands (ECF 68), satisfying Rule 23(b)(3)’s
24 superiority requirement.

25 **IX. CONCLUSION**

26 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Motion be
27 granted.
28

1 Dated: December 18, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,

2
3 **AHDOOT & WOLFSON, PC**

4 By: /s/ Robert Ahdoot

5 Tina Wolfson

6 *twolfson@ahdootwolfson.com*

7 Robert Ahdoot

8 *rahdoot@ahdootwolfson.com*

9 Theodore W. Maya

10 *tmaya@ahdootwolfson.com*

11 Bradley K. King

12 *bking@ahdootwolfson.com*

2600 West Olive Avenue, Suite 500

Burbank, California 91505

13 Tel: (310) 474-9111; Fax: (310) 474-8585

14 Cornelius P. Dukelow

(admitted *pro hac vice*)

15 *cdukelow@abingtonlaw.com*

16 **ABINGTON COLE + ELLERY**

320 S. Boston Avenue, Suite 1130

17 Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103

18 Telephone & Facsimile: (918) 588-3400

19 Keith S. Dubanevich

(admitted *pro hac vice*)

20 *kdubanevich@stollberne.com*

21 **STOLL STOLL BERNE LOKTING & SHLACHTER**
22 **P.C.**

209 SW Oak Street, Suite 500

23 Portland, Oregon 97204

24 Telephone: (503) 227-1600

25 Facsimile: (503) 227-6840

26 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Class Counsel*